

Short Communication

A tribute to Giovanni Anania: Scholar, Mentor, Friend

This section reports the contributions to the special session chaired by Jo Swinnen - held at the 29th International Conference of Agricultural Economists, Milan, 9-14 August 2015 - to honor the memory and contribution of Giovanni Anania. Giovanni suddenly and unexpectedly passed away on 15 July 2015.

Giovanni has been for many of us a warm colleague and friend, and an example of moral integrity, leadership and commitment to any endeavor he engaged in. Those of us who had the privilege of working closely with Giovanni count our collaborations with him as among the most stimulating and rewarding of our careers. He was mentor of many students and especially in Italy he was reference for various generations of agricultural economists.

Giovanni began his career as an outstanding economist getting a post-graduate diploma at the Portici Centre in Naples and earning the PhD from the University of California at Davis. He quickly rose through the ranks and became full professor and Head of the Department of Economics at the University of Calabria, Italy. Giovanni was a great scholar and participated in or coordinated many national and international research projects. He published many books and articles, receiving the European Association of Agricultural Economists (EAAE) Quality of Policy Contribution Award. Giovanni provided several relevant scientific contributions mostly in the fields of agricultural policy analysis and international trade. He significantly contributed to the profession as an active member of national and international associations and recently served as President of the EAAE. He also played an important role in the policy debate both at the national and international level through consulting activities with European Commission, FAO, ICTSD, and OECD. Last, but not least, Giovanni was also a great organizer. He was ready to do whatever it takes to organize successful scientific events, defining stimulating agendas and planning memorable social outings, such as the IATRC conferences in Isola Capo Rizzuto and Capri.

The special session in honour to the memory of Giovanni has been organised in two parts: the first part focuses on Giovanni's contributions to agricultural economics, while the second one on Giovanni's contributions to scientific associations and institutions.

We are very grateful to the colleagues and friends of Giovanni who contributed to that session and to the hundreds of agricultural economists who participated.

Margherita Scoppola
President of AIEAA

Tribute with respect to his work on trade policies and agreements

MARY BOHMAN (ERS-USDA, US), COLIN CARTER AND ALEX MCCALLA (UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS, US)

We write these words to help us celebrate the life of Giovanni Anania both as a talented and internationally recognized applied agricultural economist, but more importantly as a warm, caring, ever positive human being. We were blessed with the opportunity to work with him as a scholar, enjoy him as a conscientious, understanding and collaborative colleague, and as a loving friend whom we loved in return. Indeed, he was a true and loyal friend and a loving husband to his wife Margherita. We shall all miss him but are much better off for having known him. We focus on two facets of Giovanni: *the man*-the wonderful human being and *the scholar* -whose work will be his lasting legacy.

Giovanni The Man

We all first encountered Giovanni at Davis as a fellow student, as a co-author and as his major professor. We all watched as he did extremely well in our program and was always intellectually curious and challenging to be around. Once you met Giovanni you were hooked for life. You wanted to be his friend and he reciprocated in kind. Giovanni was the heart and soul of his Davis graduate student cohort. He and Margherita hosted large, Italian style dinners at their graduate student apartment with tables, chairs and dishes they borrowed from their close friends Ila and Mondì Temu to seat everyone.

Giovanni's leadership among students portended his future leadership roles that we all have benefited from. He was always fair, seeking to see all sides of the issue, careful in his judgements and sensitive to those on the other side. He didn't have a discriminatory bone in his body.

After he left Davis all of us counted him as a valued colleague and forever friend. Giovanni was constantly engaged internationally with the International Agricultural Trade Research Consortium (IATRC), a member since 1986 when he attended as a graduate student. He was a regular and active participant, with the AAEA, IAAE and the European Association of which he was the current President.

All three of us marveled at his organizational prowess as we worked as a team to put on two WTO Conferences in Calabria and Capri, both cosponsored by the IATRC. We were all thrilled when Giovanni went out of his way to attend our 50th Anniversary Celebration of the UC Davis PhD program this past March. He came, he said because he was a life time fan of the UC Davis program. As usual he broke up the house as he helped recall some of the non-academic happenings of his decade. For all of us it was our last chance to enjoy being Giovanni's friend. We are proud that he was such a distinguished ambassador for the UC Davis program.

Alex McCalla had the special pleasure interacting with Giovanni closely over an extended period as he worked through a complex theoretical and modelling topic in inter-

national trade. In his PhD dissertation acknowledgement he wrote: “Working with Alex McCalla was always stimulating and encouraging. The lessons I learned from him go far beyond the matter of this dissertation. I only hope that I will be able to establish with my students the kind of relationship that I had with him”. That relationship lasted 30 years until July 15th and will always be cherished. We have abundant evidence that he was loved by his students. We shall all miss him, but we will be sustained by remembering the good times.

Giovanni The Scholar

Giovanni came to Davis with a firmly established concern for the economics of agriculture and the welfare of rural people in Southern Italy. His early writings were concerned with market imperfections and the impacts of discriminatory policies. At Davis he chose to work on international trade issues because he saw things like targeted exports subsidies, embargoes and trade preferences as real issues in agricultural trade but as he tried to model them he found traditional spatial trade models did not properly deal with the possibility of countries being both importers and exporters of the targeted product. His thesis addressed and provided a modelling approach to deal with the issue. This was the beginning of his life time interest in multilateral, bilateral and unilateral trade policies, analysis of their impacts and critical role in trade negotiations.

In the early 1990s, Giovanni (and Alex McCalla) published a paper showing the importance of alternative assumptions regarding arbitrage behavior when modeling discriminatory trade policies. They found the previous literature was quite restrictive due to the use of simple arbitrage rules. They applied their more realistic model to the US-USSR grain embargo in the late 1970s and concluded that this type of export embargo is unlikely to be effective.

In this same time period, Giovanni examined the domestic and international impacts of the U.S. Export Enhancement Program (EEP) for wheat. EEP used targeted in-kind subsidies to expand U.S. exports and was designed specifically to compete with subsidized exports from the European Community (EC). With his co-authors, Mary Bohman and Colin Carter, Professor Anania found that EEP could not be welfare-improving for the U.S.

It was in this early work that Giovanni demonstrated his tremendous skill for modeling complicated international commodity markets. He had a talent for seeing the core economic drivers instead of getting lost in the obscure details. This was one of the central themes of his research program throughout his career. Just a few years ago he published an insightful paper on calibrating mathematical programming spatial models.

In a 2000 OECD report, Giovanni identified the major agricultural trade policy concerns of OECD non-members. The insights from his research were used to supplement OECD documents that considered how emerging and transition economies were affected by the implementation of the Uruguay Round Agreement. Professor Anania assisted the OECD in understanding the issues at stake for emerging and transition economies in multilateral trade negotiations and the resulting policy implications.

In a paper entitled “Agricultural Export Restrictions and the WTO: What Options do Policy-Makers Have for Promoting Food Security?” Giovanni examined the likely trade, food security and development implications of various options for disciplining agricultural export restrictions. This paper was published in 2013 by the *International Center for*

Trade and Sustainable Development and it was a thorough analysis of the implications of various options for disciplining agricultural export restrictions.

Giovanni was the leading economics expert on the world market for bananas. He conducted a number of influential studies on regional trade deals between the EU (the largest importer of bananas) and banana exporters and the resulting impacts on trade in bananas and the overall competitiveness of the industry.

Continuing his scholarship in complex linkages between international and domestic markets, last year, with Margherita Scoppola, Giovanni published a timely paper on the importance of assumptions made about market structure and firm behavior in empirical trade policy analysis. Recognizing that market structure matters in agricultural trade, they incorporate imperfectly competitive markets in a spatial modeling framework. Their paper will serve as a roadmap for other trade researchers trying to include realism in their models.

We hope by now we have documented what an amazing guy Giovanni was. He was a first class applied economist with a clear sense of what the real issues were and a great loving friend who you really wanted to hug. We shall miss him. To Margherita and his family our thoughts are with you. May you be comforted, as we will be, by remembering how fortunate we all were to have been able to share him for a while. Peace.

Giovanni Anania: Shaping the future of European agricultural policy¹

JEAN-CHRISTOPHE BUREAU (AGROPARISTECH PARIS) AND ALAN MATTHEWS (TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN, IRELAND)

Introduction

In today's session we are remembering Giovanni Anania's contribution as a scientist, but for many who are present we remember him even more for the person he was. Jean-Christophe first came to know Giovanni through mutual friends at Davis, whereas I came to know him relatively recently. Giovanni and I were participants in an EU FP6 project *TradeAg* coordinated by Jean-Christophe that began in 2005. Subsequently, we both participated in the EU FP7 project *AgFoodTrade* also coordinated by Jean-Christophe. During one of those projects Giovanni invited us to hold a project meeting in an agriturismo in Calabria. I remember well from that visit both Giovanni's love of food and of his region. Then in my time as President of the EAAE 2011-2014 Giovanni was the Association's Vice President and we worked closely together until Giovanni succeeded me as EAAE President in August 2014.

Giovanni's work on EU agricultural policy can be characterised in a number of ways. He early on recognised the inadequacy of analyses of EU agricultural policy which looked at the domestic market alone as though this existed in isolation from the outside world. The growing importance of international agricultural trade flows, the creation of new rules governing agricultural protection and support in the 1994 Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture and Giovanni's own interest in international agricultural policy issues meant that he always approached the analysis of EU agricultural policy with an international perspective in mind.

His approach to EU agricultural policy was also informed by a thorough understanding of local and sectoral issues. Giovanni saw no contradiction between devoting time to better understanding the development of agriculture in his local region of Calabria and analysing the rules governing international agricultural trade.

Although he strongly believed in the importance of rigorous scholarship in academic research, he also insisted on the importance of communicating the results of that research to policy-makers and using that research to influence policy. Giovanni was not only a modeller but also someone who could use the results and think about the bigger picture. He was always willing to patiently repeat his explanation of complex economic issues, and

¹ This is an extended version of the tribute which was delivered by Alan Matthews at the special session organised to honour the memory and contribution of Giovanni Anania to the agricultural economics profession at the 29th International Conference of Agricultural Economics, Milan, 9-14 August 2015. We would like to thank many friends and colleagues of Giovanni who contributed to the preparation of this tribute: Filippo Arfini, Federica Demaria, Fabrizio De Filippis, Tassos Hanriotis, Jonathan Hepburn, Koen Mondelaers, Krijn Poppe, Luca Salvatici and Margherita Scoppola.

was known for starting this repetition with a gentle “Now once again...”. Indeed, he recognised that the research-policy interaction was a two-way street, and some of his more important papers were originally prompted by a request to explore a policy question, as we will see.

The Italian debate on the CAP

Giovanni's earliest work related to the structural problems of agriculture in the Calabria region and his master's thesis was on different issues related to part-time farming in Italy. As a result of this interest he participated in the well-known Arkleton Trust study on farm household adjustment in Western Europe in 1992 which strongly highlighted the role of pluriactivity in contributing to farm household income on smaller farms.² Giovanni participated in this project with a number of colleagues who would become important collaborators in his later work, including Fabrizio De Filippis. De Filippis was interested in agricultural policy analysis, and particularly the Common Agricultural Policy, to which he had been introduced by Michele De Benedictis, while Giovanni had returned from his PhD studies in the United States with a strong background in agricultural trade policy, influenced by Alex McCalla. This project began a fruitful collaboration over the following decades.

At the beginning of the 1990s the debate in Italy on shaping the future of the CAP was in full swing. An early outcome of Giovanni's collaboration with De Filippis was a book which they jointly edited on *The GATT Agreement and European Union Agriculture*, in Italian, published in 1996.³ This book was the final outcome of a research project financed by the Italian National Research Council which also included many other younger Italian agricultural economists. It was during this project that the second IATRC meeting was held which led to the publication of the book edited by Anania, Carter and McCalla, *Agricultural Trade Conflict and GATT - New Dimensions in North American - European Trade Relations*.⁴ During the period 1997-2000 Giovanni was a member of the INEA research team *Osservatorio delle Politiche Agricole dell'Unione Europea* led by De Filippis which produced a number of reports on EU agricultural policy developments. In the 1997 volume Giovanni wrote the chapter concerning international trade and the GATT negotiations.⁵

In 2000 Giovanni put together a team of young Italian researchers to examine the state of the art in quantitative modelling of the CAP, a project which was also supported by the Italian National Institute of Agricultural Economics. The names of the people that Giovanni gathered to work on this project are well-known in the profession today in both

² Anania, G. and Gaudio, F., Farm Differences, Family Strategies and Agricultural Structural Changes. A Synthesis of the Results of the Baseline Survey in Calabria (Italy), in *Structural Policies and Multiple Job Holding in the Rural Development Process*, Arkleton Trust & Department of Land Economy, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen (GB), 1991, pp. 264-282.

³ Anania, G. and De Filippis, F. (eds), *L'accordo Gatt in agricoltura e l'Unione Europea*, Franco Angeli, Milano, 1996.

⁴ Anania, G., Carter, C.A and Mac Calla, A.F. (eds), *Agricultural Trade Conflict and Gatt - New Dimensions in North American - European. Trade Relations*, Westview Press, 1994.

⁵ Anania, G., Le implicazioni dell'accordo GATT del 1994 per le Politiche Agricole dell'UE, in AA.VV., *Rapporto sulle politiche agricole dell'Unione Europea nel 1997*, INEA, Roma, 1998, pp. 15-41.

academic and policy circles. The overall objective of the research program was to provide a comprehensive analysis of modelling issues and applications related to the CAP. The results of the study were published in 2001 in a volume *The contribution of some quantitative research to the evaluation of their effects on the Italian agriculture*.⁶

Giovanni's contribution to the project was, not surprisingly, a chapter on modelling agricultural trade liberalisation and its implications for the European Union. This paper remains a superb overview of the state of play of global agricultural trade models as of the 1990s. His critique of existing studies is thorough, exhaustive and compelling. His conclusion was that the efforts to model agricultural trade and trade policies, taken as a whole, were not fully satisfactory and left much to be desired. Giovanni's recommendations for improvements were based on the observation that effective solutions already existed to many of the problems he identified, but that "greater care and attention must be paid to tailoring models to answer the specific questions addressed, and abandoning once and for all the claim that, once it has been set up, a model can be used to simulate any change in the policy scenario whatsoever". His manifesto for improved modelling practice consisted of five points, and these principles also underpinned his own modelling work particularly on bananas as we will see:

- First, make use of a model which has a structure and specific features which are coherent with the question to be addressed.
- Second, think about integrating the use of different models instead of trying to adapt a model to do things it was never designed to do.
- Third, model the functioning of market and trade policy instruments more effectively and more realistically.
- Fourth, strive for more effective coordination and greater cooperation between modelling efforts, through joint projects and the sharing of information on models and data bases.
- Fifth, put effort into the construction of reliable data bases, which supply the information needed to model both market agents' behaviours and policies.

Indeed, these are precisely the directions that simulation modelling has taken, and Giovanni was both prophetic and prescient in identifying these needs.

During the period 2000-2002, Giovanni was the national coordinator for a "Scientific Research Program of National Importance" under the Italian Ministry for University and Research on the topic *WTO negotiations on agriculture and the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Union*. This project resulted in the book, published in Italian, *Reform of EU agricultural policy and the WTO negotiations*.⁷ The chapters in

⁶ Anania, G. (ed), *Valutare gli effetti della Politica Agricola Comune. Lo "stato dell'arte" dei modelli per l'analisi quantitativa degli effetti delle politiche agricole dell'Unione Europea*, NIS, Napoli, 2001 (with Filippo Arfini, Piero Conforti, Pasquale De Muro, Pierluigi Londero, Luca Salvatici, and Paolo Sckokai). Most chapters were translated in English and are available on line: <http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/agsineawp/14804.htm>; <http://econpapers.repec.org/scripts/search.pl?ft=conforti>; <http://econpapers.repec.org/scripts/search.pl?ft=arfini>; <http://econpapers.repec.org/scripts/search.pl?ft=sckokai>; <http://econpapers.repec.org/scripts/search.pl?ft=anania>, accessed 12 October 2015.

⁷ Anania, G. (ed), *La riforma delle politiche agricole dell'UE ed il negoziato WTO. Il contributo di alcune ricerche quantitative alla valutazione dei loro effetti sull'agricoltura italiana*, FrancoAngeli, Milano, 2005.

this book, many of which were published in English in international journals, applied the modelling methodologies which had been described in the earlier project to Italy. Many of those involved recall the satisfaction of being able to apply empirical models to policy questions and to make a contribution to the policy debate. Giovanni also contributed to the 2004 book edited by De Filippis written in the wake of the partial decoupling introduced by the Fischler Mid-Term Review of the CAP, *Towards the new CAP: The Reform of June 2003 and its Application in Italy*.⁸ Giovanni was again the national coordinator of an Italian Scientific Research Program of National Importance, together with Luca Salvatici, Margherita Scoppola and Fabrizio De Filippis, on *European Union Policies, Economic and Trade Integration processes and WTO negotiations* during the years 2008-2010.

We have remarked that an important feature of Giovanni's approach was his capacity to link academic rigour with political debate and dissemination of research results. All the researchers working in the projects that he coordinated were strongly encouraged to take part in dissemination and participate in the political debate. The link with INEA in these projects with its institutional relationships with the Italian Ministries of Agriculture and Foreign Affairs and with the Italian Government gave Giovanni the opportunity to offer support to Italian policy-makers on these issues. During this period Giovanni and Fabrizio were often consulted with regard to the Italian position on the CAP reform process, especially for the CMOs that were most important for Italy (e.g. olive oil). Also as part of his insistence on linking scholarship with the real world, between 2007 and 2009 Giovanni was a member of the steering committee of "Gruppo 2013", an Italian think tank active on themes related to CAP, markets, and international relations coordinated by De Filippis and sponsored by Coldiretti, the principal Italian farmers' organisation. In 2008 he prepared a paper for this group with Alessia Tenuta on the effects of regionalisation of aid in the single payment scheme on its spatial distribution in Italy.⁹

European interventions on CAP

Around the same time as the INEA project on CAP modelling got under way, Giovanni took part in the first of many discussions on shaping the future of the EU's agricultural policy. The MacSharry reform of the CAP in 1992 had shown that change in the CAP was possible, albeit with strong prodding from external pressures such as the need to be able to respond to criticisms from trading partners in negotiating the Uruguay Round agreement under the GATT. In 1996 an important conference in Cork, in which Giovanni participated as an invited expert and panel member, issued the Cork Rural Development Declaration which set out a ten-point rural development programme for the Union.¹⁰ In 1997 DG AGRI had published the report of the influential Expert Group chaired by Allan Buckwell *Towards a Common Agricultural and Rural Policy for Europe*.¹¹ This opened up a

⁸ De Filippis, F., *Verso la nuova Pac. La riforma del Giugno 2003 e la sua applicazione in Italia*, Quadernidel Forum Internazionale dell'Agricoltura e dell'Alimentazione, 2004.

⁹ Anania, G. and Tenuta, A., 'Il futuro dei pagamenti diretti nell'Health check della Pac: regionalizzazione, condizionalità e disaccoppiamento', in De Filippis, F. ed, *L'Health Check della Pac. Una valutazione delle prime proposte della Commissione*, Quaderni del Gruppo 2013, Edizioni Tellus, Roma, 2008, pp. 29-39.

¹⁰ http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rur/leader2/dossier_p/en/dossier/cork.pdf, accessed 12 October 2015.

¹¹ http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/publi/reports/buckwell_en.pdf, accessed 12 October 2015.

vision of transforming the CAP from a policy of generalised direct support payments to a policy with specific targets for market stabilisation, environmental and cultural landscape payments, rural development incentives and transitional adjustment assistance. It was an important milestone in the evolution of the CAP and it opened the way for further reflections on the direction of reform.

In December 2000 another expert *Working Group on the Future of the CAP and its implications for rural Europe* co-chaired by Winfried von Urff and François Colson started as a joint initiative of the 'Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung' (ARL, Academy for Spatial Research and Planning, ARL) and the 'Délégation à l'Aménagement du Territoire et à l'Action Régionale' (DATAR). The group was sometimes referred to as Buckwell II as it included some of the experts involved in the preparation of the Buckwell report, and Giovanni was also a member. The *Vision for Sustainable Rural Economies in an Enlarged Europe* produced by the group proposed a shift in funding from Pillar 1 to Pillar 2 of the CAP while recommending a more territorial, bottom up approach to the development of rural areas through Pillar 2.¹² Giovanni prepared a paper assessing the extent of pressure for a change of the CAP to be expected from WTO in the light of the Doha Ministerial Declaration in 2001. The papers were completed in summer 2002, just after Commissioner Fischler proposed his Mid Term Review in July 2002, so it is hard to assess the influence of this report. It certainly fed into the demands for a stronger Pillar 2 which characterised the evolution of the CAP during the following decade.

Another area of Giovanni's involvement with the CAP was his early contribution to helping to formulate priorities for future research. Already in 1998, he took part as an expert in a workshop on research activities priority setting for the 5th EU Framework Programme of RTD. In 2003 he participated in a workshop to review the draft work programme for "Scientific Support to Policies" for the 6th EU Framework programme of RTD. In 2006, he was a member of the group that undertook the first foresight analysis in the field of agricultural research in Europe for the Standing Committee on Agricultural Research (SCAR).¹³ The major task of the Expert Group was to review the available foresight studies relating to eight "major driving forces" which were to be considered together in the formulation of four future scenarios of the agro-food system evolution. Giovanni prepared the background paper on Economy and Trade. Giovanni later presented an extended version of this background paper at a Workshop on "*Reflections on the Common Agricultural Policy from a long run perspective*" organized by the Commission's Bureau of European Policy Advisers in Brussels in February 2009.¹⁴ These reports (the fourth in the series was published in 2015¹⁵) played an important role in the research planning / agenda setting process of the SCAR.

¹² Anania, G. et al., *Policy Vision for Sustainable Rural Economies in an Enlarged Europe*, Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (ARL) & Délégation à l'Aménagement du Territoire et à l'Action Régionale (DATAR), Studies in Spatial Development, n. 4, Hanover, 2003.

¹³ *Foresighting food, rural and agri-futures*, European Commission, Directorate-General for Research, February 2007 (with T. Gaudin, coordinator, J. Cassingena-Harper, K. Cuhls, L. Downey, J. Leyten, J. E. Olesen, Y. Schenkel, M. Walls and P. Raspor).

¹⁴ Anania, G., *The EU Agricultural Policy from a Long Run Perspective: Implications from the Evolution of the Global Context*, Working Paper 09/4, Research Project on "*European Union policies, economic and trade integration processes and WTO negotiations*" financed by the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (Scientific Research Programs of National Relevance), University of Calabria.

¹⁵ <https://ec.europa.eu/research/scar/index.cfm?pg=foresight4th>, accessed 12 October 2015.

He was a keen observer of the most recent CAP reform. He was an invited speaker at the conference on the public debate on the CAP post-2013 organised by the DG AGRI in 2010, and he participated in many organised sessions to discuss the reform at meetings of the Italian and European Associations of Agricultural Economists, taking a critical but even-handed view of the Commission's proposals. Many of us will remember his technicolour slide presentations in which he dissected with exemplary precision the main elements of the reform. In his writings on the CAP, Giovanni had the rare gift of being able to maintain an appropriate balance between positive and normative analysis. In his interactions with farmers' unions and policy makers, he always liked to be wholly independent from the most popular positions of stakeholders. Some CAP analysts heavily emphasize a normative approach to what is wrong with the CAP according to the economics textbook: this is correct but often irrelevant in the public debate. Other analysts accept too readily the status quo on the argument that it is the best (or least bad) possible policy given the political constraints. Giovanni was always realistic and pragmatic in his analysis but never gave up the dream of a better policy.

His last contribution on this topic is a magisterial summary of the 2013 CAP reform, written together with Maria Rosaria Pupo D'Andrea, which is the opening chapter of a book edited by Jo Swinnen on the political economy of the recent CAP reform.¹⁶ His final paragraph is worth quoting in full:

"It should be clear by now why an overall assessment of the reformed CAP remains difficult. The Ciolos reform brought positive innovations in the CAP as well as innovations which have brought the robust, consistent path outlined by the previous reforms since 1992 to a grinding halt. Those who hoped for a significant step forward along the same path, with the reform identifying a clear set of consistent strategic goals pursued by the CAP, a more targeted distribution of support and a significant portion of the financial resources devoted to increasing the market competitiveness of farms and promoting the production of public goods, probably have good reasons for being disappointed. Those who hoped the financial resources allocated to EU policies for agriculture and rural development would not be severely cut (as feared at the beginning of the decision process), and for the reformed CAP to bring as few changes as possible, are probably quite satisfied by the final result."

In other words, CAP reform remains unfinished business. Sadly, with Giovanni's much too early death, he will no longer be here to help to shape its future.

Research and policy advice on EU banana policy

I now turn to Giovanni's research and policy work on EU banana policy. Giovanni started to work on bananas in 2004. The initial stimulus came from an Italian consulting company COGEA which had been commissioned to undertake an evaluation study on the banana CMO for the EU. Giovanni was one of a number of economists who were engaged as consultants on this study. The EU had been required to restructure its banana import

¹⁶ Anania, G. and Pupo D'Andrea, M.R., The 2013 Reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, in Swinnen, J. ed., *The Political Economy of the 2014-2020 Common Agricultural Policy: An Imperfect Storm*, Brussels, Centre for European Policy Studies and London, Rowman and Littlefield international, 2015, 33-86.

arrangements in 1992 following the introduction of the single market which made the previous system of national import quotas inoperative. This import regime had been successfully challenged at the WTO by a group of Latin American banana exporters and the US. During the negotiations to start the Doha Round in 2001, the EU had been granted a waiver until 2006 after when it was required to introduce a tariff-only import regime for bananas. The Council adopted this regime in November 2005 to start in 2006 but it was immediately challenged at the WTO and once again the EU found itself as a defendant in a WTO banana case.

Giovanni had been struck by the existence of different tariff rate quotas (TRQs) applied by the EU to imports of bananas from different groups of countries: this was, in his view, a good example of the need to use a spatial model as the most adequate tool to properly model bilateral trade policies. In this context, he developed the first version of his spatial model for bananas to analyse the impact of the 2006 CMO reform.¹⁷ Subsequently, when the EU found itself yet again as a defendant at the WTO, Giovanni was thus the main source for the EU to know what would be the consequences for EU production and agricultural income of different options with respect to border protection in the bananas dossier. He assisted both in person and with his spatial model in the negotiations, not directly at the negotiating table, of course, but supporting in the background. Without his modelling support, it would have been much more difficult to assess the impact of the choices made.

His work on bananas led to a series of first-class papers, including one in *Food Policy* for which he was awarded the European Association of Agricultural Economists *Quality of Policy Contribution Award* in 2010.¹⁸ This work was not only policy-relevant but also contributed to methodological breakthroughs. One of the problems with spatial trade models is that they typically show a discrepancy between the observed and optimal (equilibrium) quantities. That is, there is typically a divergence between the realised quantities of the produced and consumed commodities and their trade flows, and the production, consumption and import-export patterns generated by the model for the same year. Previous researchers had tended to either ignore these discrepancies or to make ad hoc adjustments. In a 2011 paper in *Economic Modelling* with Quirino Paris and Sophie Drogué, Giovanni proposed a calibration procedure in which the calibrated models generate solutions that exactly reproduce quantities produced and consumed as well as trade flows.¹⁹

However, he continued to worry about another dimension in which he felt his spatial model was unrealistic. He was conscious that perfect competition (assumed in his spatial model) was a heroic assumption particularly when dealing with trade in bananas. Two anti-trust reports by the EU Commission reporting evidence of non-competitive behaviour by banana traders were the final “push” to tackle this problem and, together with Margherita Scoppola, they further developed the spatial model to compare the results of

¹⁷ Anania, G., The 2005 WTO arbitration and the new EU import regime for bananas: a cut too far?, *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 33, (4), 2006, pp. 449-484.

¹⁸ Anania, G., EU Economic Partnership Agreements and WTO negotiations: A quantitative assessment of trade preference granting and erosion in the banana market”, *Food Policy*, (35), 2010, pp.140-153; Anania, G., The 2006 Reform of the EU Domestic Policy Regime for Bananas. An Assessment of Its Impact on Trade”, *Journal of International Agricultural Trade and Development*, (4), 2, 2008, pp. 255-271.

¹⁹ Paris, Q., Drogué, S. and Anania, G., Calibrating spatial models of trade, *Economic Modelling*, 28, 2011, pp. 2509-2516.

trade policy change simulations under different market structures.²⁰ The most important innovations from the modeling point of view were the inclusion in a spatial model of both upstream and downstream market power by traders and the consideration of a range of different oligopolistic structures instead of focusing only on Cournot competition. A further insight was that, in combination with the two step calibration procedure developed in the earlier paper, it was possible to derive an estimate for the degree of market power in the banana market from the observed trade outcomes.

In the run-up to the Geneva Agreement on Trade in Bananas in December 2008 which resolved the disputes between the EU and the Latin American banana exporters and the US, tensions had also arisen among developing countries over a broader issue in the Doha Round negotiations, namely, the extent and pace of tariff reduction on tropical and preference products. While there was a general agreement that tariff reductions should be deeper on tropical products, this was resisted by those countries which benefited from special preferences and which would lose by deep reductions. Work at the International Centre for Sustainable Trade and Development (ICTSD) in Geneva had identified that the dispute really revolved around a handful of products, including bananas. They invited Giovanni to Geneva to talk to the WTO delegates of the countries mainly concerned and to present his modelling work on bananas. His even-handed and dispassionate treatment helped to allay some of the concerns and was part of the process in helping the break the deadlock which resulted in the Geneva Agreement in December 2008.

I think it speaks volumes about Giovanni's ability to undertake and present his research in an independent, rigorous and yet fair-minded way that when Ecuador was concerned about the impact on its banana exports to the EU of the conclusion of an EU free trade agreement with the Central American countries, it was to Giovanni that they turned, even though he had been the main economic advisor to the Commission a few years earlier during their WTO dispute with the EU. All of this work on bananas was disseminated to a wider policy audience in a fruitful relationship with the ICTSD during those years.²¹

Giovanni's most recent work on bananas was as an expert for the consulting company commissioned by DG AGRI to undertake an evaluation of the EU's agricultural trade relationships with the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. Giovanni's specific contribution was to examine the role of trade preferences in the development of Cameroon's banana exports to the EU. Again highlighting the way in which policy advice and scientific research continually interacted throughout Giovanni's professional career, this work was the stimulus for his contributed paper *The role of trade policies, multinationals, shipping modes and product differentiation in global value chains for bananas. The case of Cameroon* accepted for this conference. Alas, Giovanni will not be here to present it.

²⁰ Anania, G. and Scoppola, M., Modeling trade policies under alternative market structures, *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 36, 2014, pp. 185-206.

²¹ Anania, G., *How would a WTO agreement on bananas affect exporting and importing countries?*, Issue Paper No. 21, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, Geneva, 2009, pp. 1-38; Anania, G., *The implications for bananas of the recent trade agreements between the EU and Andean and Central American countries?*, Policy Brief No. 5, 2010, pp. 1-5; Anania, G., *Implications of Trade Policy Changes for the Competitiveness of Ecuadorian Banana Exports to the EU Market*, Issue Paper No. 10, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, Geneva, 2011, pp. 1-35.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we remember a scholar of the utmost integrity, which cost him dearly in his professional career. He had a very strong sense of right and wrong. While very serious and committed on the important issues, he was very relaxed and warm and a great companion once the important issues were addressed. Giovanni had the happy knack of bringing people together and making things happen. He was always well-prepared and well-briefed, and always constructive. For all of those who worked with him, he was the most important point of reference both as a source of intellectual stimulation and as a guide to personal conduct.

We greatly miss Giovanni, and our thoughts are with his wife Margherita at this time.

European Association of Agricultural Economists (EAAE)

IMRE FERTO (CORVINO UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST, HUNGARY) AND ALAN RENWICK (UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN, IRELAND)

Giovanni was a very warm and passionate colleague and friend who served the EAAE for many years. As president he was dedicated to making the EAAE a strong and leading organisation for the benefit of all agricultural economists across Europe. His presence, inspiration and dedication will be missed by all within the EAAE.

Giovanni first became active in the EAAE through his membership of the programme committee for the IX congress held in Warsaw in 1999. Following this he was elected to the EAAE board and served between 2002 and 2008. During this time he played an instrumental role in the development of the Association. In particular, he commented in detail on the renewal of the constitution process that took place in 2003 and led the introduction of the EAAE prizes. In 2011 he joined the Board again but this time as Vice-President before becoming President at the 2014 conference in Ljubljana.

Since becoming President he began both internal and external initiatives to strengthen the Association. Internally he began the process of strengthening the relationships between the EAAE and its members, in part by reinvigorating the role of the Liaison officers. Externally his initiatives included the signing of an MoU with the Australian Association and he had begun discussions with the UK Agricultural Economics Society. Giovanni had an ongoing desire to see the EAAE generally more connected globally and in particular to be represented at international meetings. Before becoming President, for example, he was responsible for organising sessions at the IAAE conference in Durban and at the AAEA and WAEA meetings. Throughout his association with the EAAE, he was also an avid supporter of the Phd workshops and saw them as having a key role to play in developing the next generation of European Agricultural Economists. It is perhaps fitting that one of his last engagements for the Association was speaking at the workshop held in Rome in June of this year.

Whilst he made many contributions to the professional development of the EAAE, he also contributed in many other ways. Anyone who met him at EAAE events benefited from his warmth and enthusiasm and through this he added much to the camaraderie of the association. Giovanni's personality shone through in everything from his wide selection of jumpers through to his famously multi coloured slide presentations!

Whilst his departure has left a massive hole at the helm of the EAAE, all those on the Board are determined to continue on the course he established, but he will be sorely missed.

Associazione Italiana di Economia Agraria e Applicata (AIEAA)

GIOVANNI CANNATA (UNIVERSITÀ DEL MOLISE, ITALY)

Giovanni Anania accompanied my professional and personal life for more than 30 years. It has been a privilege for me to know him, sharing experiences with him and enjoying his friendship and professional knowledge.

It is hard to speak in his honor without being moved by warm memories and emotions, but I will try. And I will try also to avoid any rhetoric tone.

I would like to recall a few aspects of Giovanni's life with specific reference to his Italian academic and professional career, considering that other colleagues already talked about his outstanding achievements at international level. Specifically, I'd like to recall also Giovanni's civil engagement as a man of the South, a son of Calabria, the land he came from and he honored a lot.

Giovanni's professional life is very consistent with the topic of ICAE 2015 - where his presence is deeply felt, and this is why we wish to pay him a tribute - "Agriculture in an inter-connected world". The topic of interdependence between agriculture and the economy and society is central in his research since the very beginning, and this is why we met some thirty years ago.

Giovanni knows how to master even the most sophisticated analytical tools with great simplicity and to share them with colleagues and collaborators, but never forgetting why these tools are developed for, which is providing answers to relevant problems. He is the quintessence of an applied economist. This is true not only in his well-known research on international trade or European agricultural policies, but also in his "Italian" researches focusing on the transformations of agriculture, public intervention in Southern Italy as well as the labour market in agriculture and pluriactivity or the analysis of some production sectors such as the citrus fruit, olive oil, and dairy sectors.

Likewise remarkable is Giovanni's good common sense in applying quantitative approaches to the study of territorial systems and to the analysis of business structures, thus drawing implications for the future. Providing insights for future directions in real life settings featured his works on Europe and international trade as well as on his Italian works, especially as far as Calabria is concerned. Calabria towards the future.

The analysis of the implications of these researches contributes a lot in strengthening our collaboration in a particularly fertile season for research in Italy, that of the so-called Targeted Research Programs, when the government, via the National Research Council, promoted multi-year projects concerning specific objectives, like the IPRA (Increase of agricultural resources productivity) or the RAISA (Advanced research for the innovation of agricultural systems). These were the good old times for research, in Italy, unfortunately gone away. With the collaboration of other colleagues from the University of Calabria, Giovanni remarkably contributed first to solve some issues in territorial analysis (and I greatly benefited of his help and advise) and later to build up a think tank on international trade and policy.

Referring to institutional service, fundamental is Giovanni's contribution to many organizations such as INEA, the Italian National Institution of Agricultural Economics (recently shut down by an unfortunate decision of the Italian government) and ISTAT, the Italian National Institute of Statistics.

When INEA regional offices were established, Giovanni was its great catalyst in Calabria. This office is a sort of grass-root think tank, a knowledge lab well rooted in the local environment but looking at the global. A gym for the many youths who began a research career, some more successful than others, but all of them holding a huge debt of gratitude to Giovanni.

Considerable is also his contribution to ISTAT, where Giovanni actively participates to the modernization of agricultural statistics and to the design of agricultural Census.

Giovanni is also the promoter of a number of initiatives aimed at aggregating scholars and experts. For instance, I remember the support he gave me during my presidency of the Italian Association of Agricultural Economics or his contribution to the Rossi Doria association and, more recently, to the establishment of AIEAA, the Italian Association of Applied Agricultural Economics, whom he is a co-founder.

Furthermore, I underline his role as one of the most active member of the Group 2013, an interesting experience where not only producers, but also stakeholders at large and policy-makers make use of scholars' independent advices and analyses. Even in this case Giovanni's role is key, walking in the footpaths of a glorious tradition of agricultural economists that can be traced back to Ely's Institutional School.

Besides his active and constructive contributions to congresses, workshops and seminars, I would like to mention also an activity where Giovanni is specially good at, that is mentoring of younger colleagues, probably a legacy of his experience at the Portici Centre. It is worth mentioning his enthusiastic, friendly, informal contribution to the Summer Schools for PhD candidates and Post-Docs, organized by SIDEA first and later on by AIEAA. Giovanni offers his experience and knowledge to the young participants by stimulating them with provocative questions such as: "I got my PhD: what shall I do with it?"

When the AIEAA is established, Giovanni provided precious suggestions on its Statute design, so that it has to be firmly research-oriented, more open than other Italian associations to the international debate, and focusing on the "analysis of agricultural economics and policy in a multidisciplinary context".

Giovanni's curriculum is so outstanding both from research and profession service viewpoints, and well known by all of you, as proven by the fact that many of you all elected him to the EAAE Presidency, that what I just said are probably only minor aspects. Therefore, I would like to turn now to something that probably not everybody in this room is aware of, that is his civil engagement.

Giovanni is one of the best examples of a scholar who was educated in his own home region, specialized abroad and then decided to come back in his own region to contribute to its development, despite the offer of positions in more prestigious academic institutions. Giovanni is an example of social investment aiming at building human capital in an underdeveloped region. Before concluding, let me recall some activities showing his engagement with and dedication to the development of his home region, the special relationship with Calabria featuring his whole life, just the way they were told me.

Giovanni is a member of the editorial board of “Meridiana” (1989-1995), a multidisciplinary journal founded in 1987 by a group of scholars looking at the Italian “Mezzogiorno” in a very open-minded way, well beyond the received cultural stereotypes. He always looked at the problems of “Mezzogiorno” (inequality and geographical disparities, political and social regulation, environmental policies, etc.) addressing a demand of knowledge whose coordinates were scientific rigor and policy relevance.

In a conference significantly entitled “Public choices, private strategies, and economic development in Calabria. Knowledge to make decisions”, Giovanni wrote:

“Universities are often rightly criticized for their limited ability in offering to the surrounding territory the results of their researches. The awareness of this limit brought the Department (of Economics, Ed.) to open its doors and to decide to disseminate, mostly to a non-academic audience, the results of those researches more directly concerned with the public and private choices particularly relevant for the economic development of Calabria. A Conference and a volume are just the first step to make available what we do to ones who, with different roles and responsibilities, are in charge of making decisions, which are relevant for the regional development. We hope that our readers will share our view about the usefulness of what we have done so far, pushing us to do more and better in the future.”

As an example of his civil commitment, let me tell you that Giovanni actively supports the cooperative breeding farm “Valle del Bonamico”, helping in solving its organizational and marketing problems. The cooperative is active within an initiative of the diocese of Locri-Gerace, devised to organize unemployed young people in the valleys “Bonamico” and “Careri” and to offer them labour opportunities as an alternative to a fate of marginalization and probably mafia enrolment. Employment and entrepreneurship as a possible remedy to underdevelopment and social deviance in Calabria. Solidarity and trust-building as an antidote to the prevailing individualism and familistic closure.

Giovanni enthusiastically joins, as a funding partner, also the cooperative “Terre Grecaniche”, whose mission is to rebuild local communities able to plan their own future. The cooperative’s goal is the improvement of productive use of local resources and the development of farming in the “Grecanica” area (or Bovesia: a part of the province of Reggio Calabria, where the spoken dialect is a derivation of ancient Greek). The cooperative allocates part of its revenue to the creation of microcredit projects and solidarity initiatives in developing countries as well as in projects aimed at contrasting school drop-out in the “Grecanica” area.

Finally, Giovanni is also engaged in local political life: he gives always, when required, his personal contribution at local and regional level in informal terms, offering his knowledge derived from years of studies on the issues of the agricultural sector and, more generally, of economic development.

Giovanni was to me a colleague with first class academic and human talents.

Giovanni was a partner in academic fights.

Giovanni shared with me fruitful research programmes.

Giovanni was a leader for fellows and colleagues.

Giovanni is, and I’m sure will still be, a reference and a fraternal friend to many of us.

European Commission

JOSÉ MANUEL (CUQUI) SILVA RODRIGUEZ

We had many wonderful contributions on Giovanni Anania - the academic - and on his countless friends. I would like to make a small contribution in between professional and personal, because behind that great agricultural economist who was Giovanni also was a great person.

Negotiations in the EU banana sector were always complex. I think that this is the product in which there are more differences of opinion - differences between the dollar area producers and ACP producers, but also differences between European countries. Differences between the very liberals, such as Germany, and those with production, as Spain or France, or those who want their former colonies to continue to export to Europe. There are also differences between those who want to spend to sustain the sector, and those who refuse any budgetary effort.

So when in 2005 we had to propose an external tariff on bananas, you can imagine that this was anything but easy to agree in COREPER. Each Ambassador had a different opinion. We did not look like easily reaching a common position, but we had to do so before the start of the ministerial meeting of the WTO in Hong Kong, as I am referring to the month of December 2005. I still remember very well the date - the agreement came at the beginning of an evening on the first Friday of December 2005 (I had to catch a flight the same evening...).

Fortunately, we negotiators from the Commission had a very effective weapon - we had agreed to commission an external study on the banana sector, a study led by Giovanni. Today, it sounds normal that the Commission requests external academic studies, but at that time this was still very new. In fact this study pioneered the collaboration between DG-AGRI and the academic world.

As negotiator, I felt very well protected and supported, not only by colleagues who were with me in the meetings - Aldo, Mary, Tassos, Elisabetta or Nicolas among others - but above all I felt supported by the factual arguments provided to me by the study done by Giovanni. And although no one particularly liked the numbers produced by Giovanni, no one was also able to contest them - and if nobody seems happy with an agreement, but can live with it, this is a sign of a good agreement!

The study on the banana market also allowed me to meet Giovanni. I am a person who is interested in people above all. Meeting Giovanni was a wonderful gift. His intelligence, his humour, his humanity and especially that look of his, will always accompany us.

Death, Margherita, although sure, is always unwelcome. Fortunately, somehow we sense that people do not leave us completely; and I think the smile of Giovanni remains alive among us.

European Commission

TASSOS HANIOTIS (DG AGRICULTURE)

I am the last to speak in this session we would all have liked never to have taken place. I will thus not focus on Giovanni's academic contributions, already mentioned, but raise instead three more personal aspects in our professional relationship.

But before I do so, I would like to start from something Cuqui already mentioned – negotiating with “a number” - and bring some personal relevant background information. I started my career in the Commission with Cuqui (in a market unit), in a job more related to my passport than my field of academic expertise (trade). But I soon moved into an analytical unit, and started working on developing a market model at a time a myth was circulating in the corridors of DG AGRI, one stemming from a former Director's General statement that claimed “don't give me numbers, give me room for manoeuvre”!

Yet everything that Cuqui said about his ability to better negotiate as a Director General was stemming exactly from the fact that he had numbers - the solid numbers that Giovanni had produced. And it is evidence of the monumental change of mentality that has taken place in DG AGRI since then, with Giovanni's work fitting perfectly well in solidifying this change.

I don't exactly remember when I first met Giovanni. Mary mentioned to me earlier that he was in the ICAE in Buenos Aires, the first one that I also went to. But I do not recall meeting him there. I do recall though when I first came across his name. It was during these “modelling years” of mine, when out of curiosity I was leafing through the AJAE annexes for names of Europeans that received, like myself, their PhD degree from US universities. This is when I first noticed Giovanni's name, and remembered it especially since he worked with my idol of the time, Alex McCalla.

In person I believe I first met him at the ICAE in Sacramento in 1997. Since then, we often met, especially during my Fischler years and beyond. We developed a pretty close relationship based on what we broadly agreed on - that numbers matter, that policy concepts matter, and that trade distortions are real issues for policy making. From this professional relationship, I would like to mention three areas - one where we always agreed, on where we often disagreed, and one more personal.

We always agreed on trade, on the necessary path of trade reform, on the speed of reform - which has to be the right one to allow smooth adjustment, and on the importance of always looking at the big picture. Giovanni was a pragmatist, and it was this pragmatism that gave him, as a trade modeller, the capacity to put things into perspective taking the real world as his starting point. After all, models are supposed to be a representation of reality, and not the other way round.

We often disagreed on income support, and more specifically on its logic. As many academics do, Giovanni considered that the target of income support should be meanstested. I believed, and continue to do so, that family income should not be an item for farm policy since taxation (a national responsibility in the EU) is there to address differences in the level of wealth, and implementation complexities would make any such meas-

ures counter-productive. I always considered this debate trivial; more important is for me the debate about the logic of greening, or voluntary coupled support - and it is exactly in these areas that I will miss Giovanni's critical point of view the most.

His contribution to Jo Swinnen's book on the recent CAP reform shows how pertinent the policy questions he raised in this book are going to be in the very near future.

But I would like to finish with a more personal note, one stemming from the common interest we developed in recent years on something that united us beyond academics. We both came from a very old part of this old continent of ours, a part with so many similarities. Very often, such similarities are drawn from our problems, and from the fact that their analysis does not always point to a "lysis" (solution), but sometimes even to paralysis. Yet our similarities are much deeper and different than this. Scanning the internet you will fast discover that Calabria is the region first occupied by two tribes which ancient Greeks called "oenotrians" and "itali". The first name comes from the Greek word for wine, whose production was of interest to Giovanni. And the "itali" are a reminder that the origins of your country may come more south than some would like to believe.

But this part of Italy also goes by the name of *Magna Grecia*, indicating the long historical links between our countries. And the name comes as a more pertinent reminder that this region of the world is where trade, and especially trade in food items (Giovanni's main area of academic interest), has been from ancient times a factor that unites people, reflecting and promoting their cultures and diversity.

In this part of the world, in the two corners of the Italian boot, a dialect is still today spoken by a few thousand people - a dialect called by some medieval, or better, byzantine Greek, also known by the name of Griko. On numerous occasions Giovanni invited me to visit together this part of Italy, and I will always regret that I will never have the chance to do it with him. I will certainly do it for him, though.

And I am sure that, from wherever he is, he will have learned how to tell us in this dialect " *steo ettù ma 'sà* " - "I am here with you"! For me, the only thing that is left to say is to use the very word we have in modern Greek to bid farewell to a friend: Addio!